



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

OUR NEW  
NEW TESTAMENT

---

*NICHOLSON*





600094655Z







# OUR NEW NEW TESTAMENT



OUR NEW  
NEW TESTAMENT

*AN EXPLANATION OF THE NEED  
AND A CRITICISM OF THE FULFILMENT*

BY

EDWARD BYRON NICHOLSON, M.A.,

LATE SCHOLAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD,  
AND PRINCIPAL LIBRARIAN OF THE LONDON INSTITUTION



RIVINGTONS  
WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON

MDCCCLXXXI

1881



THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

Volume 131, Part 1, 2001

Published by the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and France

Subscription prices (which include postage, packing, and handling charges) are as follows:

Volume 131, Part 1, 2001

Volume 131, Part 2, 2001

Volume 131, Part 3, 2001

Volume 131, Part 4, 2001

Volume 131, Part 5, 2001

Volume 131, Part 6, 2001

Volume 131, Part 7, 2001

Volume 131, Part 8, 2001

Volume 131, Part 9, 2001

Volume 131, Part 10, 2001

Volume 131, Part 11, 2001

Volume 131, Part 12, 2001

Volume 131, Part 13, 2001

Volume 131, Part 14, 2001

Volume 131, Part 15, 2001

Volume 131, Part 16, 2001

Volume 131, Part 17, 2001

Volume 131, Part 18, 2001

Volume 131, Part 19, 2001

Volume 131, Part 20, 2001

Volume 131, Part 21, 2001

Volume 131, Part 22, 2001

Volume 131, Part 23, 2001

Volume 131, Part 24, 2001

Volume 131, Part 25, 2001

Volume 131, Part 26, 2001

Volume 131, Part 27, 2001

Volume 131, Part 28, 2001

Volume 131, Part 29, 2001

Volume 131, Part 30, 2001

Volume 131, Part 31, 2001

Volume 131, Part 32, 2001

Volume 131, Part 33, 2001

Volume 131, Part 34, 2001

Volume 131, Part 35, 2001

Volume 131, Part 36, 2001

Volume 131, Part 37, 2001

Volume 131, Part 38, 2001

Volume 131, Part 39, 2001

Volume 131, Part 40, 2001

Volume 131, Part 41, 2001

Volume 131, Part 42, 2001

Volume 131, Part 43, 2001

Volume 131, Part 44, 2001

Volume 131, Part 45, 2001

Volume 131, Part 46, 2001

## PREFACE

THE object of this little book, and the rapidity of its appearance, call for a few preliminary words.

It was undertaken to show that, while the Revised Version does in great part fulfil the hopes of those who desired as faithful and full a rendering as can be conveyed in English idiom, it still leaves those hopes in a very appreciable degree unfulfilled. And the writer wished to show this not out of a love of fault-finding, but that he might bring others to feel that the Revised Version ought yet again to be revised before it should be accepted as sufficient. At the same time it seemed to him that it was ungracious and misleading to confine himself to adverse criticism, and that the opportunity might well be taken of giving a popular explanation of the need of the new version and of its merits.

The rapidity with which the book has appeared (it was indeed written in the spare hours of a fortnight) may be justified by saying that the writer has been engaged more or less for the last ten years on the subjects to which it relates.



# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT . . .	1

## CHAPTER II.

RELATION OF THE AUTHORIZED AND REVISED VER- SIONS TO THE ORIGINAL TEXT . . .	9
---	---

## CHAPTER III.

THE AUTHORIZED AND REVISED VERSIONS AS TRANS- LATIONS . . . . .	15
--	----

## CHAPTER IV.

NEED OF FURTHER REVISION . . . . .	24
------------------------------------	----

## APPENDICES

GREEK OF WORDS REFERRED TO IN CHAPTER IV. .	73
RENDERING OF THE AORIST . . . . .	76
PUNCTUATION OF THE REVISED VERSION . . .	80



## CHAPTER I.

### History of the Original Text.

**T**HE New Testament is written throughout in Greek. The conquests of Alexander had established Greek kingdoms in Syria and Egypt several hundred years before, and Greek had probably become nearly or quite as familiar in Palestine as English now is in Wales—so familiar, at least, that the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, was largely used. And the writers of the New Testament naturally chose to write in Greek rather than in the native speech (called Aramaic), because Greek was spoken over a great part of the Roman Empire, and was understood by considerable numbers of people in other parts of it. Just as naturally also, they did not attempt to copy Greek classical writers, but wrote in the popular Greek of their part of the world, tinging it at the same time, to some extent, with Jewish modes of expression.

The early Church was, it is true, unanimous in affirming that Matthew wrote in Aramaic, and that the Greek gospel bearing his name is only translated—a tradition much debated in modern times. There is another, but very feebly supported, tradition, that

Mark's gospel was first written in Latin. We find also an early statement that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul in Hebrew, and afterwards translated, and this view has lately been supported with much ingenuity. We, however, possess these, together with the remaining books of the New Testament, only in Greek, into which, if translations, they must certainly have been rendered early in the 2nd century.

Most people would doubtless suppose that the books of the New Testament would from the first be copied from one manuscript into another with such studious accuracy as to keep the original text almost unimpaired from age to age. On the contrary, there are in the existing manuscripts probably not fewer than 150,000 "various readings," as differences of text are called.

We can trace four distinct types of the New Testament text. That of which we have earliest evidence was a text chiefly current in the West, and, though prevalent within two or three generations after the books of the New Testament were written, was yet, strangely enough, the least faithful of all. Those from whom it proceeded seem to have thought that they were entitled to abbreviate it, or to add to it from other sources, or to harmonize the parallel passages in it, just as they pleased. Next, about the close of the 2nd century, we meet with a much purer text, chiefly prevalent at Alexandria, and another text still purer, which has been called the "Neutral" text. Lastly, about the end of the 3rd century, the Syrian text arises; its framers chiefly aimed at smoothness, drew indiscriminately on the three previous texts, and as a

consequence produced a text much inferior to either the "Neutral" or the Alexandrian.

Theologically speaking, Constantinople was the child of Antioch, and so the Syrian text became also the text of the capital of the East. Outside the Eastern Empire Teutonic and Muhammadan invasions, as Professors Westcott and Hort have lately said, "destroyed the MSS. of vast regions, and narrowly limited the area within which transcription was carried on"; while the very knowledge of Greek became almost extinct throughout Western Europe. And hence, when Greek learning was revived in the West, the vast majority of the manuscripts which early editors of the New Testament had before them were manuscripts of this inferior Syrian type.

We shall see in the next chapter what are the relations of the Authorized and Revised Versions to the original text; before coming to that subject it is well that the reader should understand some of the most certain causes of the enormous number of various readings in the manuscripts of that text.

A large part of these are clearly due to *mistakes of sight* on the part of copyists. A copyist having taken his eye from the manuscript for a moment would, on returning to it, often have his eye caught a line or two lower down than the point at which he left off by the same word, or ending of a word, as that which he had last written, and would begin again there, leaving out the intervening words; or, if his sight were bad or the ink faded, he would sometimes confound letters which were written very much alike; as *a*, *d*, and *l* (A Δ Δ),



or *e*, *th*, *o*, *s* (Ε Θ Ο Σ). Or he would sometimes repeat, leave out, or transpose letters.

A very large number of various readings are as clearly due to *mistakes of hearing and phonetic spelling*. *Ai* and *e* were sounded alike and were continually interchanged. *Ē*, *ei*, *ī*, *oi*, *u*, and *ui* differed very little from each other, the first three not at all; this also was a fertile source of confusion. And long and short *o* differed so little in sound that they, too, often changed places. Many of these changes of spelling were deliberate; for we have cases where the copyist of a manuscript has written words in the classical spelling but the corrector of the manuscript has altered this to another spelling which gave just the same sound. Probably also a good many confusions of spelling are due to copyists writing from dictation. If a number of copies of a single manuscript were wanted, the shortest way to obtain them would of course be for one man to read out the manuscript while a number of others wrote from his dictation, and these others would be liable to write a wrong word in place of another word which had the same sound—as if an Englishman so writing were to put down “What do ye hear?” when the book which was being read out to him had “What do ye here?”

A curious example of this kind of mistake is found in the Greek of Matt. xi. 16, “Children sitting in the market-places, which call unto their fellows, and say, We piped unto you, and ye did not dance.” Here the manuscripts are at variance as to whether the word rendered “fellows” is *hetairois*, “fellows,” or *heterois*,

"others"; and we have four different readings, "the others," "the fellows," "the others of them," "the fellows of them." All this variety arises out of the fact that the two words were pronounced exactly alike, that one was written, either phonetically or by mistake, instead of the other, and that some later copyist or copyists either added or took away "of them" to make the text more intelligible.

*Mistakes of memory*, again, have caused many various readings. The copyist, having read or heard dictated to him several words at a time, has altered the order in putting them down, or has written a wrong word for another common word of the same meaning (as if one wrote "answered" for "replied").


Again, *mistakes of conjecture* might cause various readings. The word before a copyist's eye might be so faded or blotted as to be illegible, or a piece of the manuscript might have been torn away, in which case he might supply what he conjectured to have been written, and his conjecture might be wrong.

Moreover, the *marginal notes* of some former possessor of a manuscript were sometimes mistaken by its copyists for additions to or corrections of the text. One of the most curious instances (which I select because I do not know whether it has been explained) is in Matt. x. 3, where the name of Lebbaeus or Thaddæus is followed by the name of Simon the Cananaean. Whatever may be the right reading of the former apostle's name, it is absolutely certain that he was not called Judas in this place; but four of the best manuscripts of the early Latin translation made in the

2nd century have neither Lebbæus nor Thaddæus, but "Judas the Zealot." It is clear that, in the manuscript from which they got this reading, someone had written "Judas" in the margin against the name of Lebbæus or Thaddæus (meaning that this was the same apostle who is called Judas in Luke vi. 16); that he had also written "the Zealot" in the margin against the word "Cananæan" (meaning that the other apostle was the same who is called "the Zealot" in Luke vi. 16); and that these two notes were afterwards mistaken for a single note, supposed to be a correction of the name "Lebbæus" or "Thaddæus," and so substituted for that name. It is possible that to the incorporation of an erroneous marginal note in one of the earliest manuscripts of Matthew we owe the fact that in Matt. xxvii. 9 a quotation from Zechariah is attributed to Jeremiah; originally the name of the particular prophet may not have been written at all—the owner or copyist of the manuscript, fancying the words came from Jeremiah, may have written "Jeremiah" in the margin—and the next person who copied the manuscript may have supposed this name part of the text, and inserted it accordingly.

Some copyists, again, were led to alter the text in small particulars by their *dislike to unpolished forms of grammar or style*.

*The harmonizing of parallel passages and the introduction of new matter* have been spoken of above as a vice of the Western type of text. The former of these was a very common fault of copyists, the latter comparatively rare. It is possible that at least in



many cases these harmonizings and additions were due to the copyist mistaking marginal notes for additions to or corrections of the text; and it is also a very serious question whether some additions (particularly certain ones which are clearly not due to a copyist's own invention, but are seemingly taken from a true evangelical source) may not really have been added by the very authors themselves after the first copies of their works had been taken. This is a view which has been very strongly advocated by two of the most distinguished Revisers, Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Scrivener, and is in the fullest accord with the practice of modern authors in revising and adding to their first editions.

In concluding this sketch, it is well to add that the great majority of the various readings would be considered of the most trivial kind were it not a matter of the deepest interest to their investigators to ascertain as nearly as possible the exact words, and even the exact forms of words, in which the New Testament was written; while from the doctrinal point of view only the most infinitesimal fraction are of any great importance. It was said by the great Bentley—it has been quoted from him by Dr. Scrivener, and it would be acknowledged almost without qualification by anyone, of whatever religious views, who is acquainted with the subject—that the real text “is competently exact indeed in the worst MS. now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them; choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design, out of the whole lump of read-

ings . . . even put them into the hands of a knave or a fool, and yet with the most sinistrous and absurd choice, he shall not extinguish the light of any one chapter, nor so disguise Christianity, but that every feature of it will still be the same."

## CHAPTER II.

### **Relation of the Authorized and Revised Versions to the Original Text.**

**W**E have thus traced the history of the original text down to Reformation times, with the causes of its corruption. We know what were the editions of that text which the translators of the Authorized Version had before them to translate from. For the formation of those editions only a very limited number of manuscripts had been used, including only<sup>1</sup> two which were very early, while even of those two but slight use was made. Again, as we shall see on page 11, there are very ancient translations of the New Testament into various languages, which serve to show how the original ran in the manuscripts from which they were translated ; but not one of these had been used beyond inaccurate printed copies of the Latin Vulgate. Then, too, no account had been taken of the abundant citations from the New Testament made by ancient writers, which serve to show what readings they had before them. And, lastly, the early editors of the

<sup>1</sup> "Beza's manuscript" and "the Clermont manuscript" mentioned on p. 11.

printed text had hardly any knowledge of the principles which ought to guide us in deciding between various readings. Hence the Greek texts from which the Authorized Version was translated were extremely inaccurate.

Since 1611 all this has been changed. The industry of scholars has discovered a vast number of manuscripts, of which the most ancient, and a great many later ones, have been carefully examined. The ancient versions, and the citations of early writers, have also been compared with these manuscripts. And, lastly, the causes of corruptions of the text, and the principles by which true readings are to be discerned and false ones rejected, have been laboriously investigated.

The oldest manuscripts of special importance are :

The Sinaitic, written about 350 A.D., found in 1859 at St. Katharine's Monastery on Mount Sinai, and now at St. Petersburg : it has the New Testament entire.

The Vatican, of about the same age, in the Vatican Library at Rome : it extends only to the middle of Heb. ix. 14 (the rest having been added in the 15th century).

The Alexandrian, written early in the 5th century, sent to England in 1628 by a Patriarch of Constantinople who had formerly been Patriarch of Alexandria, and now in the British Museum : but for the loss of about twenty-nine chapters it would be complete.

The "manuscript of Ephraem," of about the same age, so named because, after the writing had been

obliterated as far as possible (yet not beyond the power of chemical revival), some of the works of Ephraem the Syrian were written over it: it is in Paris, and contains about two-thirds of the New Testament in fragments.

"Beza's manuscript," of the 6th century, presented by Beza, in 1581, to Cambridge University. It contains nearly four-fifths of the Gospels and Acts.

"The Clermont manuscript," written near the end of the 6th century, found about three hundred years ago at Clermont in France: it is in Paris, and contains, almost complete, the Pauline Epistles and Epistle to the Hebrews.

The oldest versions from the Greek into other languages are these: Three Latin—one of the 2nd century, one (a revision) of the 4th century, the third, or "Vulgate" (a much more thorough revision by Jerome), of the end of the 4th century. Two Syriac—one of the 2nd century (fragments of the Gospels only), the other perhaps of the 3rd century. A South and a North Egyptian, both perhaps late 2nd century, the former in fragments only; and a Gothic, of about 350 A.D., containing fragments of the Gospels and Pauline Epistles.

A list of the writers of the first five centuries whose works furnish citations from the New Testament would run to some scores of names. The Greek writers who yield the most results are Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria (end of the 2nd century); Origen (early 3rd); Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Didymus,



Epiphanius, and Chrysostom (4th); and Cyril of Alexandria (5th). The Latins who do so are Tertullian (end of the 2nd century); Cyprian (3rd); Lucifer of Cagliari, "Ambrosiaster," Jerome, and Augustine (4th). It has been said, loosely, that, if the New Testament were lost, Origen alone contains sufficient quotations to enable us to restore it.

The reader now has, it is hoped, some slight idea of the value of the materials which have been collected by modern editors of the Greek text for correcting the exceedingly inferior editions which lay before the translators of the Authorized Version.

The Revisers have not only had before them editions in which the evidence for and against each various reading (not being an obvious clerical error) is minutely set forth, but have had among them the three greatest living experts in this branch of criticism—Dr. Scrivener, and Professors Westcott and Hort. Dr. Scrivener, whose knowledge of all details respecting New Testament manuscripts is probably quite unapproached, is a critic who, while necessarily radical in comparison with the editors of three hundred years ago, is in comparison with those of our own day somewhat conservative. Professors Westcott and Hort have been engaged for more than a quarter of a century on an<sup>1</sup> edition and introduction to the Greek text whose importance cannot easily be exaggerated: while holding advanced critical views, they are distinguished for a very careful balancing of evidence, which shows itself

<sup>1</sup> One volume, containing the Greek text, has just been published, the other will shortly follow.

in a large number of alternative readings given in their edition.

It required a majority of two-thirds of those present at the second series of revision-meetings to introduce any reading different from that on which the rendering of the Authorized Version was based, and consequently the reader may have the utmost confidence that, generally speaking, the changes of text adopted are such as any body of competent and unbiased scholars must have adopted.<sup>1</sup> It might have been expected that this two-thirds rule would have given too great power to prejudices, which can hardly yet be extinct, against the novel readings introduced by modern editors; but so far as I have examined the Revised Version the results of modern criticism are abundantly recognised in it.

At the same time the Revisers have placed in the margin other readings, for which there was strong support, but which, if they seemed the more correct readings to any part of the company, did not so seem to the requisite proportion of more than one-third in the case of old readings and of two-thirds in the case of new ones.

One caution must be given as regards those marginal readings for which parallels in other parts of the New Testament are cited. Take Matt. xi. 19, "And wisdom is justified by her works." In the margin we read "Many ancient authorities read *children*: as in Luke vii. 35." Here many a reader might regard the fact

<sup>1</sup> In notes on Matt. x. 3, xi. 19, in Chapter iv. I have commented on two readings which are most doubtful.

that *children* is the word found in Luke as a reason for believing that it is the correct word in Matthew: "why suppose a difference between two evangelists when, according to many ancient authorities, there is no such difference?" The answer is, that we know there are undisputed verbal differences in the Gospels, and that we also know (from many cases where the evidence is so onesided as to leave no room for doubt) that copyists often assimilated parallel passages, whether from design, or unconscious recollection, or through mistaking marginal quotations for corrections of the text. *In fact, the circumstance that "children" is found in Luke is a strong argument for preferring the other reading here, though in Chapter iv. I shall show, as regards this particular passage, counter-arguments which I think very strong.*

## CHAPTER III.

### The Authorized and Revised Versions as Translations.

LET us now consider what were the chief faults of the Authorized Version as a mere translation (putting out of sight the question whether the text from which it was translated was correct), and let us take a few examples of each. To enumerate every kind of imperfection which might be pointed out in it, or to illustrate in full whatever imperfections might be chosen for notice, would be merely to do what has already been done in the last few years in books of the highest merit, and will probably be done over again in other books during the next few years. It will be enough to observe the existence of such flaws as made revision imperative, and to justify the assertion that these flaws did exist by a few striking examples of each.

*Firstly*, then, words and entire sentences were sometimes insufficiently rendered, or even misrendered. Greek learning had not been revived in England for much more than an hundred years, and hence it is not to be wondered at that there should be such occasional defects in the translation, particularly when the defect consisted in the failure to appreciate the value of some grammatical nicety.

For instance, take Matt. i. 17, "from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ *are* fourteen generations." Here the Greek is not simply "Christ" but "the Christ," and this difference, trifling though it may seem to some, has a real importance; the article makes it clear that the evangelist was really thinking of Jesus as the promised Messiah, and not using "Christ" as a mere synonym for "Jesus." So in xi. 2, "when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ," where the Greek has "the Christ," the article clearly indicates either that John's informants believed Jesus to be *the* Christ, or that John himself did—a point entirely lost by its omission.

Again, take Matt. i. 20, ii. 13, and xxviii. 2, where "the angel of the Lord" is spoken of, the Greek being "an angel of the Lord." Apart from the fact that the Authorized rendering implies the existence of only one angel, there is a very serious objection to it. In the Old Testament we several times have "the angel of the Lord" mentioned in passages where, from the context, it is generally held that God himself in visible form is thus named; it has even been supposed by some that the phrase indicates manifestations of the Second Person of the Trinity. Hence, to render the Greek as if it were "the angel" is to risk misleading associations.

Then, too, we continually find that the Authorized Version speaks of Jesus as going up into "a mountain," or entering into "a ship," in places where the Greek has "the mountain" and "the ship." It is practically certain that, unless where some particular mountain or ship just mentioned is referred to, "the mountain"

denotes the mountainous lands in general which stood behind the low-lying towns by the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and that "the ship" denotes a particular ship, possibly belonging to Zebedee (see Matt. iv. 21), which Jesus constantly used. These points are of course lost in the renderings of the Authorized Version. They have, it is true, no doctrinal or moral importance, but nothing is trivial which gives us a more graphic idea of the life of Jesus, and these passages have, moreover, a definite evidential value. Wherever "the mountain" so occurs, we may be practically sure that, directly or indirectly, the account comes to us from one who had lived beside the Sea of Galilee; wherever "the ship" so occurs, we may be practically sure that, directly or indirectly, it comes to us from one who had been familiar with the actions of Jesus on its shores.

To take another little word—in Matt. xxiv. 30 the Authorized Version has "they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven," and in xxvi. 64 "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Now here the Greek word is not "in" but "on," and the idea conveyed by this "on," but lost by "in," is that of Jesus "sitting" enthroned on the clouds, an idea repeated in Rev. xiv. 14, where the Greek is "and seated upon the cloud one like a son of man."

Nor are positive errors wanting in the translation of larger words, as in the following instances in Matthew—"before instructed" for "put forward" or "set on" (xiv. 8), "exchangers" for "bankers" (xxv. 27),

"common hall" for "governor's house" (xxvii. 27)—not to speak of cases where, out of possible meanings of a word, the translators chose one which was undoubtedly wrong, and rejected or overlooked one which was undoubtedly right, as in the rendering "testament" for "covenant" in Matt. xxvi. 28.

For an example of an entire sentence misrepresented we may turn to John iv. 29. The force of the Greek particle of interrogation there used is as if one wrote "this is not the Christ?", or, more explicitly, "this is not the Christ, is he?", or, "surely this is not the Christ?". But the translators of 1611 render quite wrongly "is not this the Christ?" and so we lose altogether the indication of the conflict in the speaker's mind—the difficulty of believing that the Christ had really come encountering the difficulty of believing that Jesus was anyone but the Christ.

*Secondly*, the translators of 1611 deliberately studied variety rather than uniformity in their rendering of one and the same Greek word, and their version abounds with examples of the unhappy results which were inevitable.

For instance, in Matt. xx. 20 the Greek runs "Then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons," but they rendered "the mother of Zebedee's children," which naturally conveys the idea that James and John had sisters. We do not know that they had not, but there is not on that account any justification for a rendering which implies that they had. Again, in Matt. xxv. 46 we read in the Authorized Version "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment:

but the righteous into life eternal"—where "everlasting" and "eternal" represent the same Greek adjective—to the probable perplexing of many a reader ignorant of Greek, who must have supposed that different words were used by Jesus, and used for the purpose of giving different shades of meaning.

Bishop Lightfoot (who has called attention to most or all of the instances which I have chosen) gives two very remarkable examples of differences in the rendering of parallel passages where the Greek is the same in each. A quotation from Deut. xxxii. 35 is translated once "Vengeance *is* mine; I will repay, saith the Lord" (Rom. xii. 19), but another time, though the Greek is the same, "Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord" (Heb. x. 30). And within twelve verses, and in the same connected argument, a quotation of Ps. xcv. 11 is rendered once "So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest" (Heb. iii. 11), and once "As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest" (Heb. iv. 3), though there is no variety in the Greek.

Probably in both these cases, certainly in the latter, the observant reader unacquainted with Greek would have supposed that a passage from the Old Testament was cited differently in two places.

One instance shall also be given, out of many furnished by Bishop Lightfoot, of the loss of point which such diversity of rendering has often entailed. In 1 Cor. iii. 17 the Authorized Version has "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy"; but "defile" and "destroy" both represent the same



Greek verb, which should have been rendered either "destroy" or "undo" in each case.


*Thirdly*, the translators of 1611 not unseldom rendered different Greek words, conveying different shades of meaning, by the same English word, thus obliterating the distinction between them.

Thus the Authorized Version altogether ignores the distinction between *Diabolos*, the "Devil," and the lesser evil spirits, which latter are commonly called in the Greek *daimonia*, "daemons," but never "devils."

Again, the word "hell" was most carelessly used to render the two terms Gehenna and Hades, the second of which simply means the world of the dead—the "grave," as we should say if we were tied down to a single word. It is needless to give examples to show that this is a difference which it was extremely important to preserve.

Sometimes an unreal verbal pointedness is given to the text by this process, as in Matt. xxi. 27, "And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you," &c., where the Greek has, not "we cannot tell," but "we do not know." This may be thought a less fault than the obliteration of verbal pointedness; but it is nevertheless a licence which no faithful translator permits himself.

Such are examples of some of the chief defects of translation in the Authorized Version which called for revision. One further reason for revision may be mentioned, which was not the less valid because it did not arise from any such fault. A great many words



and phrases in the Authorized Version had, in the course of nearly three centuries, become obsolete in the senses in which they are there used. Thus no one with a plain English education would suppose that in Matt. xvi. 23 "savourest" meant "thinkest," or that "by and by" is always used in the sense of "immediately," or that "coasts" never means "sea-coasts." Probably indeed, at one time or another, many children and persons whose knowledge of maps is small have derived some very curious notions of New Testament geography from the continual application of the word "coasts" to inland places.

And now how does the Revised Version stand when regarded from the same points of view?


Greek scholarship has made great strides since 1611. The Revision Company as a body were distinguished for such scholarship, and among them were some who would perhaps be entitled to rank among the very first Greek scholars in the world. One of their number, Professor Moulton, probably knows more of the grammar of New Testament Greek than any one living or dead. And others, such as Dean Alford, Bishop Lightfoot, and Archbishop Trench, had done work of the highest value on the Greek text. It was to be expected that the work of such a company would show a very large improvement in faithfulness on the version of 1611, and that expectation has been fully justified by the result.

The purpose with which this little book has been taken in hand is, as I have said in my preface, to show that their work ought to be still further revised, and

evidence of the need of such further revision will be given in the next chapter. To enter here into a justification of the Revisers for making changes which ought to have been made, and for abstaining from changes which ought not to be made, would diminish the effect of my criticisms, and would be undertaking that which others, including some of their own number, are certain to perform with all necessary completeness. But I cannot proceed to those criticisms without expressing my sense of the many difficulties and extreme laboriousness of their task, of the great industry and carefulness which they have devoted to it, of the very large substantial superiority of their version over that which has hitherto been in use.

Nor can I refrain from recording a most indignant protest against the spirit in which the Revised Version has been approached by writers who have been unhappily trusted to review it for some of our leading journals. I believe, and in the next chapter have given a reason for believing, that the change in the Lord's Prayer from "evil" to "the evil *one*" is from the critical point of view a mistake; but what honest-minded student, who may think likewise, can fail to repudiate such alliances as these?—

"The old reading 'evil' is retained in the margin, and, as is implied by this retention, there is, to say the least very high authority for it; and this being the case, the old form in which the prayers of Englishmen have been uttered for so many generations ought to have been respected. The change, moreover, forces into notice an important, but a disputed doctrine, while



the old form had the great advantage of being neutral on the point, and of neither imposing it upon us nor excluding it."—*Times*.

"‘Deliver us from the Evil One’ is an innovation on every ground to be deprecated, for it is sure to open up a multitude of controversial issues."—*Standard*.

Imagine Jesus judiciously agreeing to drop all mention of a resurrection of the dead on the suggestion of the Sadducees that he ought not to "force into notice an important, but a disputed doctrine," and that the contrary course was "on every ground to be deprecated" as "sure to open up a multitude of controversial issues"! Imagine him also agreeing to withdraw the Lord's Prayer, because "the old form in which the prayers of" Jews "had been uttered for so many generations ought to have been respected"!

The truth is that *at least* two-thirds of the Revisers thought, whether rightly or wrongly (I think wrongly), that "the evil one" was the more probable rendering, and so thinking were not disposed to wilfully conceal what they believed to be the meaning of Jesus; while the writers in the *Times* and *Standard*—

## CHAPTER IV.

### Need of Further Revision.

I NOW propose to show that the Revised Version, with all its merits, is still far from having achieved the faithfulness, the force, and the freedom from ambiguity which it was both necessary to seek and possible to attain ; in other words, that before becoming formally authorized it should again be revised in the light of independent criticism.

The plan which I shall adopt is to take as a sample the Gospel according to Matthew, and point out the instances of inaccuracy, want of force, and ambiguity which are to be found in the Revised Version of it. This will obviously give a fairer means of estimating the extent to which the version is defective than if all the most telling instances were selected from each separate book. It must not be supposed that I have set myself to find every possible fault with the translation ; anyone who wished to do that would read it word for word with the Greek, which I have not done for two entire verses. And I have refrained altogether from criticism in certain cases where criticism might have been effectively employed, but where there was

so much to be said on the other side as to leave serious room for doubt.

i. 1. <sup>1</sup>The book of the generation of Jesus Christ] These opening words of the New Testament were the subject of a difference of opinion among the Revisers, a <sup>2</sup>minority of whom wished to render them "The genealogy of Jesus Christ." And the minority were substantially right, although even their rendering is hardly so good as a <sup>3</sup>literal rendering of the Greek—"Roll of birth [Birth-roll] of Jesus Christ."

This expression, "Roll of birth," was evidently a general term equivalent to our words "genealogy," "pedigree"; otherwise we should certainly have expected "Roll of *the* birth of Jesus Christ." It occurs twice in the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament made by Jews in the 3rd century B.C. In the first instance (Gen. ii. 4) it is used to translate the Hebrew "generations" as referring to [the successive stages of?] the formation of the universe. In the second instance (Gen. v. 1) it is used to introduce the genealogy of the patriarchs before the flood.

<sup>1</sup> Where needful, the Greek of the passages commented on is given in Appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup> The renderings in the margin of the Revised Version are not alternative renderings which commended themselves to the entire Company, but are the renderings preferred by a minority of the Company. But, as all changes in the text had to be approved by two-thirds of those present, the nominal minority may very often have been an actual majority.

<sup>3</sup> "Roll of descent" or "Family-roll" might also be the rendering, as the Greek word has several meanings; but the same word is used in the sense of "birth" in verse 18.

Indeed, it is plainly nothing more than a title of the pedigree of Jesus which follows, and it is so printed by two of the Revisers, Professors Westcott and Hort, in their just published edition of the Greek text. And "Roll of birth [*or* Birth-roll] of Jesus Christ" would have been as clear as it is literal.

"Book" is a most unfortunate word. In the first place it conveys to the reader the idea that these words are a title of the entire Gospel, whereas under no reasonable interpretation can they refer to more than the first two chapters. In the second place, to call seventeen verses or even two chapters a "book" is very incongruous. And "generation" is also unfortunate, because it might be interpreted to refer to the age in which Jesus Christ lived, as in such passages as "whereunto shall I liken this generation?" (where the Greek word is always different), and might so countenance the idea that this is a general title to the Gospel.

**i. 18. When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph]** The Revisers tell us in their Preface (III. 3) "We have never removed any archaisms, whether in structure or in words, except where we were persuaded either that the meaning of the words was not generally understood, or that the nature of the expression led to some misconception of the true sense of the passage."

On which of these grounds did they alter "When as" of the Authorized Version to "When"?

**i. 20. But when he thought on these things]** A wrong rendering kept. The Greek is "But when he

had planned these things," i.e. the putting of her away privily.

**i. 22. Now all this is come to pass]** If the Revisers saw that these words are part of the angel's speech, they should have rendered the Greek word *de* by "And" instead of "Now."

That they are part of the angel's speech, and not, as usually misunderstood, a remark of the writer, ought to be perfectly plain from the following facts :

The phrase occurs only three times in the New Testament, and those three times in this Gospel—here, in xxi. 4 [without "all"], and in xxvi. 56. Each time it is at the end of a speech, and may be taken as part of that speech and not as a comment of the writer : in xxvi. 56 it can be *proved* to be part of the speech by comparing Mark xiv. 49. Moreover, no New Testament writer ever uses the perfect tense in calling attention to the fulfilment of prophecy, and only one writer seems to use the verb "to come to pass" in such a case—he not being the author of this Gospel, nor using it more than once (John xix. 36).

**ii. 1. when Jesus was born]** The Greek is "Jesus having been born," and "after Jesus was born" would have been better than the old rendering, which suggests that the Magi came exactly on his birth.

**wise men]** Here an old rendering has been left which conveys very erroneous ideas. The Greek is *magoi*, "Magi," strictly the name of a Persian religious caste famous for astrology, but also generally applied to all who practiced like arts (Simon "Magus," "magic"). The Greek for "wise men" in the sense



of learned men or philosophers would be quite different.

When the Authorized Version was made, "wise men" was a much more justifiable rendering. Witchcraft was then believed in, and where that belief yet lingers the terms "wise man," "wise woman," are still used to denote fortune-tellers and supposed witches and wizards (the word "wizard" is itself connected with "wise").

But to the enormous majority of readers of the English Bible "wise men" conveys a very different idea, and its retention is inexcusable. The Revisers had at least a choice of "astrologers," "soothsayers," and "diviners," to which reflexion might have added other suitable words.

ii. 2. to worship him] Here we find another instance, and a most regrettable one, of the Revisers' disregard for the changes which in 270 years the meanings of some words have undergone. I say most regrettable, because their retention of this word "worship" in cases like the present will inevitably be considered and stigmatized by many Unitarians and others who do not believe in the divinity of Jesus as an attempt to give unfair support to the doctrine of his divinity.

The word "worship" is used in the Authorized Version to render two different Greek verbs, one of which expresses adoration of a divinity, the other reverence to a superior (neither necessarily God, nor necessarily not God). It is the latter verb which is found here, in verses 8, 11, and in ten other places in this

Gospel. In one of these places it is used of obeisance to God (iv. 10), in one of obeisance to Satan (iv. 9), in one of a servant's obeisance to his master (xviii. 26), and in all the others of obeisance to Jesus (ii. 8, 11; viii. 2; ix. 18; xiv. 33; xv. 25; xx. 20; xxviii. 9, 17). It literally means "to kiss towards" the object of obeisance, and is continually used to express the Oriental form of salute by prostration or kneeling: in viii. 2 this is shown by Mark i. 40, Luke v. 12; in ix. 18 by Mark v. 22, Luke viii. 41; in xv. 25 by Mark vii. 25. And its use to signify reverence to men as well as to a divinity may be amply proved both from pagan writers and from the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament.

Now, when the Authorized Version was made, "to worship" meant nothing more than "to do reverence to," and we have remnants of this use in "Your Worship," "the Worshipful the Mayor," and "to worship" itself in the marriage-service. But in these days "to worship," outside that one instance, always implies adoration of divinity. It is true that a lover is said to "worship" his sweetheart, who is not a divinity, but, like the word "adore," this verb is always understood to imply that he treats her as if she were one: we say indeed that he "*positively* worships" her.

"Do reverence (to)" should have been substituted. The American Committee proposed "At the word 'worship,' in Matt. ii. 2, etc., add the marginal note 'The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to man (see chap. xviii. 26) or to God (see chap. iv. 10).'" It cannot be thought that the American

Committee were guided by any reasons but those of accuracy and fairness ; for out of the nineteen members only one belonged to a church or sect not believing in the divinity of Jesus. And this resolve of our Revisers not only to leave the word, but to leave it without the explanation suggested by the American Committee, will inevitably afford matter for anti-Trinitarian insinuations.

For my own part, it would be impossible for me to entertain a suspicion of their honesty, but I do believe it probable that they thought alteration or explanation would appear to many ignorant or prejudiced persons a public concession, so far, to those who deny the divinity of Jesus, and would consequently be strongly resented by all such persons ; and that in this frame of mind they forgot that every passage ought to tell its own tale clearly, and were too willing to persuade themselves that, because the word is used of respect to human beings in the marriage-service and in xviii. 26, everybody must needs understand it.

We shall find below, on iv. 3, another very obvious instance of the same weakness.

ii. 5. *by the prophet*] Here, and in all other cases where the words occur, a minority of the Revisers, supported by the American Committee, tried to get the Greek preposition properly translated "through" instead of "by."

There is in the entire New Testament only one passage (2 Peter iii. 2) in which anything is said to have been spoken "by" a prophet ; everywhere else the Greek has "through," the prophet being clearly,

regarded not as the author of his words, but a mere channel through whom they were conveyed by God to men.

In verse 15 of this chapter, where the words "by the Lord" precede, the word has been rendered "through." Is it a little thing that, where those words do not precede, the preposition should be as of old continuously misrendered, and its great doctrinal significance lost?

ii. 6. *Which shall be shepherd of my people Israel*] Why not literally—"The which shall shepherd my people Israel"?

ii. 12. *being warned of God in a dream*] There was no need whatever to keep the italicized words. It is quite true that the word rendered "being warned" does often refer to the consultation of oracles, but the literal rendering, "having been warned in a dream," would have conveyed the same idea equally well, unless "having received counsel in a dream" were still better.

iv. 1. *to be tempted*] The Greek verb used in this account, and the Latin verb *temptare*, mean "to try, test, prove." The test of virtue being inducement to sin, they came to be used in theology to signify such inducement. But except in James i. 13, 14 there seems no passage in the New Testament where the Greek verb cannot be rendered just as well literally, and in most cases it must be so rendered to give the sense of the passage.

For instance, in verse 7 of this chapter, where the same verb is used, only compounded with a preposition, the idea of tempting God is absurd. Granted that it is possible to conceive a Supreme Being who may will

to do wrong, a reference to the original of the quotation in Deut. vi. 16 will show that inducement to do wrong cannot possibly be meant, but that the "trying" or "proving" of God is referred to. And over and over again in the Gospels the enemies or critics of Jesus are represented as thus "proving" him by legal questions which were simply tests of his wisdom, and were not in the remotest degree "temptations" to sin. The English reader will find the same verb translated by the Revisers "prove" in John vi. 6 ("And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do"), "assayed" in Acts xvi. 7 ("they assayed to go into Bithynia") and xxiv. 6 ("who moreover assayed to profane the temple").

The American Committee suggested "For "tempt" ("temptation") substitute "try" or "make trial of" ("trial") wherever enticement to what is wrong is not evidently spoken of; viz. in the following instances: Matt. iv. 7; xvi. 1; xix. 3; xxii. 18, 35; Mark viii. 11; x. 2; xii. 15; Luke iv. 12; x. 25; xi. 16; xxii. 28; John viii. 6; Acts v. 9; xv. 10; 1 Cor. x. 9; Heb. iii. 8, 9; 1 Peter i. 6."

It is much to be regretted that this most moderate suggestion was not acceded to. "Tempt" in English only means "entice," and its use in the passages indicated by the American Committee is most misleading.

**iv. 2. he afterward hungered]** Authorized "he was afterward an hungred."

I do not *attack* the change any more than I attack the change of "When as" to "When" in i. 18; but I ask how it is consistent with the extract from the

Revisers' preface quoted in my note on that verse. The philological look of "an hungred" may be a little puzzling (it ought to be written in one, being a verb compounded with the old preposition *an*, i.e. *on*); but who ever did or can misunderstand its meaning?

And why is the same tense of the same verb still rendered "were an hungred" "was an hungred" in xii. 1, 3, xxv. 35, 42?

**iv. 3. If thou art the Son of God]** The Revisers in their preface (III. 2) say of the translation of the Greek article "We have been careful to observe the use of the article wherever it seemed to be idiomatically possible."

Now in xvi. 16 and xxvi. 63 the Greek is "the son of God" beyond any question whatever; but here, and in verse 5, xxvii. 40, 43, the article is wanting, and the Greek ought to have been rendered "son of God" or "God's son."

The retention of "the" is to the last degree unfortunate. Anti-Trinitarians maintain that "son of God" is simply a title which might be given to any righteous man, and carries no doctrinal significance with it. They point to John x. 34-36, where Jesus, accused of blasphemy for so calling himself, answers that in the Scripture those to whom the word of God came were even called gods; they point likewise to such passages as Matt. v. 9, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God."

Far be it from me to say that the absence of the Greek article in the passage we are considering can be justly pressed against Trinitarians. Here, and in verse 5,

there is almost unquestionable reference to the voice at the baptism a few verses before, where the Greek has "This is **THE** son of me, the beloved"; and in xxvii. 40, 43, there is almost unquestionable reference to xxvi. 63, 64, where Jesus is asked if he is "**THE** son of God," and answers that he is. Nevertheless there are those who will inevitably say that the Revisers refused to drop the article lest its absence should be used as an argument for the indefiniteness of the phrase.

I do not for a moment suppose such a thing; but I do believe it probable that here, as in the case of the verb "worship," they thought alteration or explanation would appear to many ignorant or prejudiced persons a public concession, so far, to those who deny the divinity of Jesus, and that they argued to themselves "'God,' 'Holy Spirit,' and other words, which usually have the article in the Greek, are also found without them, and no one can suppose that only *a* God and *an* Holy Spirit are referred to; we are compelled to translate those exceptions in the usual way, and why should we not translate this phrase as we do those? Moreover, these passages clearly refer to others in which Jesus is called '**THE** son of God.' And, lastly, 'the Son of God' no more implies by itself that Jesus was God's only son than 'John Smith, the son of James Smith,' on a tombstone implies that James Smith had no other sons."

Such arguments would be plausible enough but for two reasons, (1) that the Revisers professed to follow the Greek use of the article where idiomatically possible, (2) that it was their duty, not only to be above

suspicion to their own consciences, but to be above suspicion to the minds of others. As one of their number, Dr. Newth, says, in his *Lectures on Bible Revision* (113), "While no one can reasonably suppose that in the present day any body of scholars would consciously allow themselves in the translation of the Scriptures to be swayed by any theological bias, there is, as all know, such a thing as unconscious bias; and it was greatly to be desired that no such suspicion should be raised against this Revision as for a long time obtained in reference to the Revision of 1611. It was also to be desired that no ground should exist that would give an excuse for any to say that through bias of theological prepossessions the interpretations given by some to important passages of Scripture were unconsciously ignored, and that had such interpretations been brought under the consideration of the Revisers, they must, as honest scholars, have accepted them."

An over-zealous anti-Trinitarian would, perhaps, render "a son of God," which, while technically quite justifiable, would, for reasons given above, be really very much more unfair to Trinitarians than the present translation is to him. But it was possible enough to render either "son of God" or "God's son" without the slightest violence to the Greek, to English idiom, or to religious fairness.

Lastly, let me call attention to the fact that in John x. 36, "I am *the* Son of God," the Revisers, while keeping "the," have put it in italics, then why not in other places where it was absent from the Greek? and that in Matt. xxvii. 54 a minority wished to render "a



son of God," which is accordingly put in the margin. Of course the Roman centurion and soldiers who said (as the Greek literally runs) "Truly this was God's son" can hardly have meant anything more than "Certainly this was a righteous man," as Luke xxiii. 47 otherwise reports the words; but it is quite clear that they took the phrase from the Jews who had been throwing it at Jesus as he hung on the cross (xxvii. 40, 43), and that consequently it ought to be rendered uniformly throughout Matthew's narrative of the Crucifixion. But the minority did not attempt this uniformity. How easy to have rendered "God's son" in all three verses without unfaithfulness to the Greek, misrepresentation of the actors in the narrative, or opposition to the religious views of anyone.

**iv. 18. casting a net]** The Greek should have been rendered literally—"casting a casting-net"; for all that "casting a net" implies, they might have been casting a drag-net.

**iv. 24. possessed with devils]** Here a minority of the Revisers, supported by the American Committee, wished to render, literally, "demoniacs," and either that or "possessed with demons" (an alternative suggested by the American Committee) should have been adopted, for the very good reason that in the New Testament there is but one devil—Satan, of whose name *Diabolos*, "Devil," is a Greek translation—all other evil spirits being called in the Greek "demons," "spirits," "unclean spirits," &c.

**iv. 25. there followed him great multitudes]** At first sight it may seem criticism gone crazy to say that

the Greek word which the Revisers almost always render "multitude" "multitudes" ought to have been always rendered "crowd" "crowds." In reality there is a substantial difference involved. The Greek word may denote such a throng of people as would block up Trafalgar Square, or such a throng as gathers round a fallen horse in the streets; but the word "multitude" conveys only the former idea. In fact, in many cases where the Authorized and Revised Versions describe Jesus as being followed by, or as addressing, a multitude, it may be that there was really only a small assemblage. Of course, in many cases, as in the present, we have evidence that it was a very large one; but still, even here, it would have been well to render literally "great crowds," which does not necessarily involve the possibly erroneous conception of so vast a number of people as is implied in "great multitudes." In ix: 23, 25 the Revisers themselves, when altering the old rendering "people," use "crowd" and not "multitude." Other things equal, "crowd" has the advantage over "multitude" of being a short word of English birth instead of a long word of Latin birth, a consideration to which the Revisers were doubtless alive when they altered "communication" in v. 37 to "speech."

**v. 18. one jot or one tittle shall in one wise pass away from the law]** In this old rendering the graphicness of the original is altogether missed. The translation should have been "one letter i or one upstroke of a letter," &c.

The word rendered "jot" is *iōta*, the name of the letter i in Greek: it here represents *yod*, the letter i

(and the smallest letter) in the Aramaic alphabet wherein the rolls of the Law were written. The word rendered "tittle" means literally "horn," and signifies one of the little upstrokes with which it was customary to ornament the tops of letters.

Not only do the words of Jesus become still more emphatic when thus literally given, but the text proves an important archaeological fact, that in the time of Jesus the Law was written in Aramaic characters, and not in the old Hebrew characters, in which *i* was neither the smallest letter nor even a small letter.

Again, the saying of Jesus very possibly has reference to a Jewish allegory which is incorporated in the Talmud. There the book of Deuteronomy is represented to have fallen down before God and complained that Solomon wanted to remove the letter *i* from Deut. xvii. 17, a change which would nullify the prohibition against multiplying wives; whereupon God answered "Solomon and thousands like him shall perish, but not even an ornament of the *i* shall pass away from the Law."

**v. 40. if any man would . . . take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also]** Here the retention of the old rendering detracts still more from the force of the original. The word rendered "coat" means "shirt," a garment lying next the skin, reaching sometimes to the knee, sometimes to the ankle, kept close to the body by a girdle, and worn either by itself or with an outer robe—the "cloke." Of these two the ordinary dress consisted, and, were a man deprived

of both, he would have nothing left unless he had another set of clothes. But the translation of the Authorized and Revised Versions suggests that he would at least have a shirt left. The Revisers should have rendered "if any man would . . . take away thy inner garment, let him have thy outer garment also."

**v. 47. do not even the publicans the same ?]** In the margin we find "That is, *collectors or renters of Roman taxes* : and so elsewhere."

It will, I suppose, be disputed by no one that the English Bible ought as far as possible to show the meaning of every separate passage at the passage itself, and that an unlettered person ought not to be obliged to turn to a dictionary or go to a lettered person to find out the meaning of an un-English word, or else be obliged to read through all the back marginal notes till he can find an explanation of it. And, I suppose, no one will dispute that *without explanation* any Englishman who knew neither the original Greek nor the Latin word *publicanus*, and had not read through an English dictionary down to the end of the letter P, would have no idea that this word "publican" meant anything else than the keeper of a public-house. Yet, although the word occurs eight times in this Gospel, no explanation is given except here at its first occurrence, and although it occurs ten times in Luke the same neglect is shown there.

The word ought never to have been left in the text at all ; but perhaps the Revisers were afraid that "tax-gatherers" or "tax-agents" would have excited vulgar odium against the collectors of the Queen's taxes. No

doubt this was the reason which caused Wyclif, at a time when such men were specially unpopular, to use the Latin "publicans": indeed, had he given the plain meaning of the word, his version would probably have been at once suppressed. If, however, a marginal note would not have prevented all popular misinterpretation, surely some ingenuity would have framed a sufficiently harmless phrase. "Takers of duty" and "takers of custom" seem to be such.

vi 11. *our daily bread*] We are, I hope, all agreed that the translators of the New Testament should aim at producing the most faithful representation of the meaning of the original, without regarding what may have been the customary and even cherished rendering, provided that such former rendering be wrong or insufficient.

The Revisers have said in the margin that the Greek is "*our bread for the coming day.*" Despite the wish of the American Committee that the words "or *our needful bread*" should be added, I do not hesitate to say that no man with a philological knowledge of Greek can for one moment doubt that the interpretation of our Revisers is not only right, but (with the exception of "future" or "for the future," which are less natural) is the only possible one.<sup>1</sup> The word *epiousion*, rendered by our Revisers "for the coming day," is indeed an adjective of *epiousa*, a word which means "coming," and was used (without as well as with the

<sup>1</sup> Anyone who does doubt it will do well to read the appendix on the subject in Bishop Lightfoot's book *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*.

word "day," *e.g.* in Acts xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18) to signify "morrow."

In fact the Greek literally stands thus, "The bread [*or loaf*] of us of the morrow give us to-day," or, as we should say in English, "Our morrow's bread give us to-day." This order of words is not what an acquaintance with New Testament Greek would at all lead us to expect: it is quite unusual, and obviously emphatic. I regret that the Revisers did not render "Give us our morrow's bread to-day" in their text.

If, indeed, we remember that the disciples to whom the prayer was given were probably all of them men compelled to work for their bread, that many or all of them (at this time) were fishermen, and that the earnings of fishermen are particularly precarious, we shall see that the meaning of this petition was "Enable us to-day to earn enough for our support to-morrow."

The "worthless argument," as Bishop Lightfoot rightly calls it, that such a petition would be contrary to the injunction in verse 34 of this chapter is refuted by the answer that (1) the Greek of that verse literally means that we are not to *harass* about the morrow—there is all the difference in the world between harassing about the morrow and praying for it, (2) on this strained interpretation the prayer would in any case be a contravention of verses 31, 32.

**vi. 13. the evil one]** Margin "Or, *evil*." Here again the question before us is, not "which of these two renderings do we like best?" but "which represents the meaning of Jesus?" I believe the old one.

The difficulty is this. "The evil one" and "the

evil man" are in New Testament Greek *ho ponēros*, "evil" is *to ponēron*; the genitive case of *both* is *tou ponērou*, and those are the words used here.

If we look to the other passages in the New Testament where the form is alike ambiguous, we get the following very unsatisfactory result. In Matt. v. 39 either "the evil man" or "evil" is an equally probable rendering. In Matt. xiii. 38 "sons of evil" and "sons of the evil one" are both possible: at first sight (as in the former case) the latter seems decidedly right, but careful reading of the verse and the one preceding it make this very doubtful. If the meaning were "sons of the evil one," we should expect "and the enemy that sowed them is the evil one" rather than "and the enemy that sowed them is the devil"; moreover, they are opposed to "sons of the kingdom" and not to sons of any person: the phrase "sons of evil" would be quite Jewish—cf. "the son of perdition" in John xvii. 12. In John xvii. 15 we get an appreciable balance in favour of "evil"—"I ask not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them out of evil," where, if "the evil one" were meant, we should have expected the Greek preposition for "from" instead of for "out of." In 2 Thess. iii. 3 probability is, I think, for "evil"—"and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and evil men; for all have not faith. But the Lord is faithful, who shall stablish you, and guard you from evil." In 1 John iii. 12 (compared with 10) "the evil one" is, however, morally certain, and in 1 John v. 19 also (compared with 18 and 20).

The reason why amid the foregoing perplexities I believe "evil" to be the more probable rendering in the Lord's Prayer is as follows :

The doxology at the end of the prayer is rightly thrown out by the Revisers, with all modern editors, as the weight of the most ancient authority is heavy against it, and the authorities which have it vary a good deal among themselves. Doubtless it was simply a liturgical response, and the variations are relics of the uses of various churches. But it must have been added very early, and I think it very probable that in 2 Tim. iv. 18 Paul is referring to this clause of the Lord's Prayer, and to his own form of the doxology—"The Lord will deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly <sup>1</sup>kingdom: to whom the glory for ever and ever. Amen."

And if this *be* a reference of Paul's it is decisive in favour of "evil."

I trust, therefor, that "evil" may be restored in the text, and "the evil one" given as an alternative in the margin.

Since the above was written, Dr. Neubauer has pointed out (in *The Academy* for June 18th, 1881) that in the ritual of the Karaite Jews is found the prayer "And bring us not into the hands of temptation, but deliver us from all evil haps." Jesus may indeed have embodied in his prayer a petition already current,

<sup>1</sup> In confirmation of this view it is to be remarked that our earliest authority for the doxology, namely, the First Syriac version, reads only "For thine is the kingdom and the glory for ever and ever. Amen"—without "and the power."



since "Our Father which art in heaven" is a form of address familiar in Jewish prayers, and, as regards "Thy kingdom come," it may be noticed that the Talmud says "That prayer wherein there is not mention of the kingdom of God is not a prayer."

It must also be remembered that the Lord's Prayer would almost unquestionably be given in Aramaic, and that the existing Greek would be only a translation. The question then arises—To what Aramaic words does the form of the Greek translation point, and can those words indicate the Evil One? Dr. Neubauer says that the Aramaic original of *apo tou ponërou* "seems to have been מן בישא, which can be translated 'from evil' and 'from the evil,' but in no case 'from the evil one.'"

I do not particularize the evidence of the ancient translators (which is for "evil") nor of the Greek Fathers (said to be for "the evil one"), because we are much more skilled judges in difficult points of Greek than they were. The only evidence of the kind which, I think, can be fairly accepted is that, if any, which reaches back so far as to be of apostolic antiquity, and thus to have a fair chance of representing apostolic interpretation.

In the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, probably to be dated about 93–97 A.D., there is in a long address to God abounding in scriptural references a *possible* reference to this passage. The words (c. 60, § 3) are "that we may be covered by thy strong hand, and delivered from all sin by thy high arm; and deliver us from them that hate us unjustly."

The address ends, a good deal later on, "Wherefor to thee the glory and the majesty both now and to generation of generations and for ever and ever. Amen." It is very doubtful if this is a reference: but, if it is, it supports "evil," and I know of no other at all approaching it in antiquity.

**vi. 19. where thieves break through and steal]** The margin says "*Gr. dig through.*" One of the faults of the Authorized Version was its "accommodation" of Jewish customs, and "break through" concealed the fact that the Oriental thieves spoken of dug through the mud walls of houses, or burrowed underneath them. If "dig through" had been inserted in the text here and in xxiv. 43, surely no one would have failed to understand it, and, as there is no security that all future editions of the Revised Version will be printed with the marginal notes, it is a pity that this was not done.

**viii. 19. Master]** The Greek word means "Teacher," which is only one of the meanings of the English word. Accordingly a minority of the Revisers wished to render "Teacher" in all cases. It is a pity that they were not successful, and a further pity that the marginal note, "*Or, Teacher,*" was not made clearer: it *might* be supposed by some readers that the Greek word had two meanings—one, "Lord" or "Sir," and the other, "Teacher."

**viii. 20. the birds of the heaven have nests]** The margin says that the Greek word rendered "nests" means "lodging-places."

I am not a naturalist, but I presume that Dr. Eadie,

who was one of the Revisers till his death, did not speak without full knowledge when he wrote thus: "The translation is not accurate, as the Greek term means only dwelling-places, though in the erroneous popular view a nest is the home of the bird. But the bird builds its nest and uses it only for incubation, and never haunts it after its young are fledged and flown. The nest is not to the bird as the hole is to the fox, a place of usual retreat. "The birds of the air have roosting-places" which they frequent" (*The English Bible*, ii. 368-9).

The meaning at the root of the Greek word is "cover," "shelter," and the translation might have been "the birds of the heaven have shelters."

**viii. 30. a herd]** Here I come to speak of a change from the Authorized Version at which I simply lose all patience. We have seen what the Revisers say in their preface—"We have never removed any archaisms, whether in structure or in words, except where we were persuaded either that the meaning of the words was not generally understood, or that the nature of the expression led to some misconception of the true sense of the passage." Who, after such a profession, or even without it, would believe that the Revisers would systematically go about to change "an herd," "an heart," "an helmet," &c., into "a herd," "a heart," "a helmet," &c.?

Every English scholar knows that "an" is historically the proper form (being another form of "one"), which was at one time used before all consonants, and that "a" is only a corruption of it. Even at this day

there are writers who use it before such words as I have named. Its banishment by the Revisers in these cases is a senseless tampering with the language of our greatest classic.

**ix. 2. Son, be of good cheer]** Why not have substituted for "Son" the much more tender "Child" of the original, both here and in xxi. 28, instead of merely stating the meaning of the Greek word in the margin?

**ix. 10. sat at meat]** The margin says, "Gr. *reclined*: and so always." The Jews indeed were in the habit of lying on couches at meals, and it is a pity that the Revisers did not render in such cases "lay at meat." In Luke vii. 38 a woman is described as *standing* behind at the feet of Jesus, wetting them with her tears, wiping them with her hair, kissing them, anointing them with ointment. When it is said that he was *sitting* at meat, this becomes an *absolute physical impossibility*; but, if for "sitting at meat" the Revisers had substituted "lying at meat," the account would read intelligibly enough. Under the unfortunate belief that everybody reads Gospels straight through from the beginning, and remembers the explanation of every word which has been once explained to him, they have not even added a marginal note in that passage.

**ix. 16. for that which should fill it up taketh from the garment]** The Greek for "that which should fill it up" is simply "the complement of it," and the rendering might be "for the patch on it taketh from the garment"; at least we ought to have had "that

which filleth it up," and not "that which should fill it up."

**ix. 24, 25. the damsel]** Here the word "damsel" very imperfectly expresses to us moderns the pretty diminutive used in the original. I will venture to say that nearly every one would prefer to read the passage thus: "Give place; for the *little maid* is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn. But when the crowd was put forth, he entered in, and took her by the hand; and the *little maid* arose."

**ix. 30. And Jesus strictly charged them]** A minority of the Revisers preferred "sternly" to "strictly."

"Strictly charged" represents a single Greek word, rendered similarly in Mark i. 43, but "murmured against" in Mark xiv. 5, and "groaned" in John xi. 33, 38, in which last two cases a minority of the Revisers preferred "was moved with indignation."

The word originally meant "to make a noise at," thence of horses "to snort," and of men "to chafe"; in the New Testament it seems to indicate excited manner, and instead of the three diverse renderings above the Revised Version might have given us here "And Jesus was urgent with them"; in Mark i. 43, "And he was urgent with him"; in Mark xiv. 5, "And they were urgent with her"; in John xi. 33, "he was urgent in the spirit"; and in John xi. 38, "urgent in himself."

**x. 3. and Thaddæus]** The change introduced here is one of very great importance, and, although some

change was imperative, I believe that it has been made entirely in the wrong direction.

There are at least three lists of the Twelve—one here, a second in Mark iii. 16–19, a third in Luke vi. 13–16—and seemingly a fourth in Acts i. 13. These lists are in agreement as to the names of eleven out of the twelve Apostles, but not so as regards the remaining one. In Luke and Acts he is called (literally) “Jacob’s Judas,” which probably means “Judas son of Jacob.” In Mark he is called “Thaddæus.” In Matthew the only readings which have any claim to consideration are these :

- (1) *Thaddæus*. So the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, the two Egyptian versions, some manuscripts of the First Latin version, and the Latin Vulgate.
- (2) *Lebbæus*. So “Beza’s manuscript,” the translator of Origen in the 3rd century (expressly), and Hesychius in the 4th century (expressly), with some manuscripts (Greek or Latin?) which were known to Augustine (late 4th or early 5th century).
- (3) *Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus*. So 14 “uncial” manuscripts, and most later ones, the Second Syriac version, the Armenian (5th century), the Aethiopic (between 4th and 7th centuries), and (or perhaps “Lebbæus”) Chrysostom in the 4th century.

Now it is this last reading which is best supported by numbers, but numbers are not weight, and beyond any question “Thaddæus” has the most weight of

authority on its side ; while "Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus," looks very plainly like an endeavour to harmonize "Lebbæus" in Matthew with "Thaddæus" in Mark.

But external evidence is not everything, and there is a rule of criticism that out of several readings that one is the most probable which explains the origin of the others. Now does "Thaddæus" do this? if it were the original reading, can any one suggest how "Lebbæus," a name otherwise totally unknown, came to be inserted? Suppose, on the other hand, that "Lebbæus" is the original reading, and the other two are at once explained. The copyists, finding Lebbæus in Matthew and Thaddæus in Mark, set themselves to get out of the difficulty in one of the following ways. Some (for instance, Beza's manuscript and the First Latin version) altered "Thaddæus" in Mark into Matthew's "Lebbæus," but this was not a favourite expedient, because Thaddæus (Greek *Thaddaios*) was identified with Adai, the traditional apostle of Syria. So that a larger number adopted the contrary course, and altered "Lebbæus" in Matthew into Mark's "Thaddæus." A very much larger number still refrained from altering either name, and merely added to Matthew's "Lebbæus" the words "which was surnamed Thaddæus," if indeed this explanation be not a mere marginal note copied by mistake into the text.

We see then that, judging from *internal* evidence, "Lebbæus" is distinctly the most probable reading, and as such it is adopted by Tischendorf and Alford in their editions of the Greek text. I do not for a

moment suppose that either Tregelles and Westcott and Hort, who in *their* editions have adopted "Thaddæus," or the Revisers, have been consciously actuated by any wish to remove a difficulty; but I think it possible that they have unconsciously been led to underrate internal probabilities in favour of the superior *external* evidence for the other reading.

And, considering that the Revisers sometimes put in the margin exploded readings which *no* recent editor accepts (as in Matt. xix. 16, 17), they might surely have added "Some ancient authorities read *Lebbæus*: many authorities, some ancient, read *Lebbæus*, which was surnamed *Thaddæus*."

Indeed, the Revisers themselves say in their preface "Many places still remain in which, for the present, it would not be safe to accept one reading to the absolute exclusion of others. In these cases we have given alternative readings in the margin, wherever they seem to be of sufficient importance or interest to deserve notice." It can hardly be that they do not consider a difference in the name of an Apostle "to be of sufficient importance or interest to deserve notice." Do they then consider it "safe to accept" their own reading "to the absolute exclusion of" the reading of Tischendorf and Alford?

**x. 8. freely ye received, freely give]** I venture to say that not one person in six has any idea what this ambiguous translation means. I have asked more than that number, and have found only one who understood it. Everyone else said that it meant "give, as ye have received, plentifully, liberally, without stint," &c.



But the Greek word rendered "freely" does not mean this, but "gratis" (literally, "of a gift"). The Apostles are told that, as the Rabbi whose pupils they have been has charged no fee for teaching them, so they are to charge no fee for teaching others.

Had the Revisers rendered "ye received free, give free," probably the meaning would be obvious: if not, they might have substituted "without fee ye received, without fee give."

**x. 9. nor brass in your purses]** Margin "Gr. *girdles*." It was the custom to carry money in a fold of the girdle: why not have put "girdles" in the text? The adaptation of the Gospel-narrative to the customs of modern life is most objectionable, and would not be tolerated in a schoolboy's translation from a pagan writer.

**x. 16. and harmless as doves]** Here a minority of the Revisers wished to substitute "simple" for "harmless," and either that or "pure" should have been adopted. The Greek word is *akeraioi*, from a "not" and the root *ker* "mix," and means "unmixed," "simple," "pure." The old rendering "harmless" is supposed to be based on a wrong derivation from a "not" and the stem of *keraiā* "horn," as if "unhorned" "without power to wound."

**x. 25. Beelzebub]** Margin "Gr. *Beelzebub*: and so elsewhere." Surely this name has not such fond associations that there needed to be any hesitation about spelling it rightly in the text! "Beelzebub" is the more objectionable because it implies an identity with "Baal-zebub the god of Ekron," whereas it is almost

certainly a different word meaning "master of the house"—cf. "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul." Jesus, as being the head of the family of disciples, or, perhaps the master of "the house" at Caphar Nahum which is so frequently spoken of in the Gospels, was called by his enemies "Beelzebul," because that evil spirit's name meant "master of the house." There seems to be no instance of a final *b* passing into an *l*, and if so there is no justification for treating Beelzebul as a mere variant form of Baalzebul.

**xi. 6. whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me]** The Greek is "whosoever shall not be stumbled by me." The translation of this verb and the similar noun "stumblingblock" has been apparently somewhat of a stumblingblock to the Revisers.

The verb is thus rendered in this Gospel—

(1) In the active always "cause to stumble" (v. 29; xvii. 27; xviii. 6, 8, 9).

(2) In the passive (*a*) "find occasion for stumbling" (here), (*b*) "stumble" (xiii. 21; xxiv. 10), (*c*) "be offended" (xiii. 57; xv. 12; xxvi. 31, 33).

It is a pity that the Revisers did not revive the active sense of the verb "stumble," as in Beaumont and Fletcher ("This stumbles me"), Milton ("It holds out false and dazzling fires to stumble men"), Fell ("If one illiterate man was stumbled"), Locke ("One thing more stumbles me"). They might then have uniformly rendered the verb by "stumble" in the active, and "be stumbled" in the passive. "Be offended" is a very objectionable rendering, because,

although its original meaning is the same as "be stumbled," it conveys to us an idea of indignation which is not implied in the Greek. In xiii. 57, for instance, it is clear that the Greek word does not mean that the inhabitants of Nazareth were wroth with Jesus, but that they were stumbled by the apparent inconsistency of his previous history with the position which he had assumed.

The noun is thus rendered in this Gospel—

(a) "thing that causeth stumbling" (xiii. 41), (b) "stumblingblock" (xvi. 23), (c) "occasion of stumbling" (xviii. 7).

Why would not "stumblingblock" have done in all three places?

**xi. 17. we wailed, and ye did not mourn]** As regards "mourn," the margin says "Gr. *beat the breast*." The *literal* Greek is "smite yourselves," and this ought to have been put in the text.

**xi. 19. And wisdom is justified by her works]** A minority of the Revisers wished to render "was justified," and either that or (still better) "hath been justified" (see Appendix 2) should most unquestionably have been the translation.

Against "works" we have this marginal note: "Many ancient authorities read *children*: as in Luke vii. 35."

I have explained on p. 14 that the fact of "children" being Luke's word is a strong reason for supposing that "works" is the right reading here, but that there were nevertheless cogent reasons for keeping "children." I proceed to give these.

The Greek word for "children" is *teknōn*, for "works" *ergōn*. But there is another word meaning "works"—*technōn*—which differs from *teknōn* "children" only in a single letter, *χ* (*ch*) for *κ*. It is highly probable that in some early MS. *teknōn* "children" was written *technōn* "works" (perhaps by a clerical error, or the mistake of a copyist writing from dictation); that the error was corrected; that some one in whose hands the manuscript was, seeing that both words had been written, and thinking "works" made better sense, wrote in the margin *ergōn* "works"—meaning 'You are to read *technōn* "works," not *teknōn* "children" '; and that a subsequent copyist misunderstood this for a direction to read *ergōn*, and introduced it into his copy, whence it was copied into other manuscripts. A year would easily suffice for these changes.

"Works" is indeed read by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and was in some known to Jerome (whether Greek or Latin he does not say). It is also read by the Second Syriac version, a later Syriac (6th century), the North Egyptian version, the Armenian version (5th century), and the Aethiopic version (between 4th and 7th centuries).

"Children" nevertheless rests on even superior authority. Not only is it in "the manuscript of Ephraem" and "Beza's manuscript," and apparently, so far as is known, in every manuscript whose reading has been ascertained except three, but the corrector of the Vatican manuscript (after the scribe had copied it) has substituted it for "works." It is also read by

the First Latin version, the Second Latin (seemingly), the Latin Vulgate, the First Syriac, the margin (7th century) of a later Syriac, the Gothic, and Chrysostom. If "children" were false, it would be a case of the assimilation of parallel passages, and I doubt whether there is any example of a false reading *of that kind* supported by such weight of authority.

As this sentence we are considering seems a stumblingblock to almost every English reader, the passage may be here paraphrased to show its connexion. John came neither eating nor drinking—he was one of the children who would not dance to their piping—and they say "He hath a devil." The Son of man came eating and drinking—he was one of the children who would not smite himself to their wailing—and they say "Behold, a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." And in each case wisdom hath been justified by these her children in the good that they have wrought, each in his diverse manner.

**xi. 23. Hades]** Is it really expected that the artisan and the cottager will understand this un-English word, that it is inserted without one syllable of explanation? And why would not "the grave" have conveyed the meaning of the original equally well?

**xii. 23. Is this the son of David?]** The force of the Greek is not properly brought out: we should have had "This is not the son of David?" *or* "This is not the son of David, is it?" *or* "Surely this is not the son of David?"

**xii. 32. neither in this world]** Here and in xiii.

22, 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 30, a minority of the Revisers rightly desired to substitute "age" for "world."

The English word<sup>1</sup> "world" originally meant "age of man," "duration of human life"; thence it came to mean "living people," and, lastly, "the inhabited globe."

It is used in the New Testament to translate two quite different Greek words—*aiōn*, "age," and *kosmos*, "universe." It is the former which is found here and in xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 30.

It is in the first place a very serious mistake to render two Greek words of such different meaning by the same English word. In the second place, except in the New Testament and the Book of Common Prayer ("world without end"), the word "world" is entirely obsolete in its original sense, and it may safely be said that even in those books no ordinary reader has any idea but that the word means "the earth."

Not only is "world" utterly misleading as a representative of the Greek *aiōn*, "age"—it is extremely important for doctrinal reasons that the Greek word should be clearly rendered. But, alas, "end of the world" might be wrongly quoted from the English New Testament *until* the end of the world, so far as concerned a majority of the Revisers, though a minority

<sup>1</sup> Formerly *weorold*, *woruld* (as still pronounced in some parts of the kingdom), from the stems of *wer* "man" (as in "werewolf"—"manwolf"), and *aldr* "age" (cf. "alder"—man, "eld," "old"). The Icelandic form *veröld* still bears on its face its derivation (*verr* "man," *öld* "age").

did try to substitute "consummation of the age" (as for instance in verse 39).

**xii. 40. whale]** Margin "Gr. *sea-monster*." Undoubtedly the Greek word denotes only a large sea-animal: why is 'whale' kept in the text?

**xiii. 24. the kingdom of heaven is likened]** Here and in xviii. 23, xxii. 2, a most interesting fact is entirely hidden by the incorrect rendering of a tense. In these three places the Greek is not "is likened," but "hath been likened," or, as the Revisers might render it (in their, as I maintain, erroneous denial of the double power of this tense in New Testament Greek), "was likened."

There can be no moral doubt that in these three places Jesus is quoting with approval parables which had been already composed by some Jewish teacher. "The kingdom of heaven" was a phrase quite common in the mouth of Jewish Rabbis, and it is said in the Talmud, "That prayer wherein there is not mention of the kingdom of God is not a prayer." As for parables, the great old commentator Lightfoot says "No scheme of Jewish rhetoric was more familiarly used than that of parables. . . . The Jewish books abound everywhere with these figures, the nation inclining by a kind of natural genius to this kind of rhetoric." "The Rabbinical parables," says the present Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, "like those of the New Testament, are commonly introduced by some such formula as *To what is the matter like?*" (*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 75).

**xiv. 19. to sit down on the grass]** For "sit down"

the margin says "Gr. *recline*." As I explained on p. 47, the Jews did not sit to meals, but lay down. Now, even granting the utterly vicious principle of altering Jewish customs to suit modern customs, why should this not have been rendered "to lie on the grass"?

**xiv. 26. It is an apparition]** As the Revisers were going to change (and rightly) the old rendering, would it not have been as well to represent the Greek *phantasma* by *phantom*? *Phantasm* is nearer still, but would not be understood by everybody.

**xv. 27. for even the dogs eat]** Does this mean "for even-the-dogs eat," or, "for-even the dogs eat"? If the former, as most people would take it, it is a most improbable and doubtfully possible rendering of the Greek: if the latter, it is not sufficiently clear. We should render, *quite* literally, "for, besides, the dogs eat." Notice how the passage reads now: "And he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs. But [*render*<sup>1</sup> And] she said, Yea, Lord: for, besides, the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table"; i.e. besides, there is no call to do it.

I may add that the word rendered "dog" in this account is not the ordinary *kyōn*, but its diminutive *kyñarion*, "whelp"; the children of men (=the children of Abraham) and the young of dogs (=the children of Canaan) seem to be contrasted. Why not "the young dogs"?

<sup>1</sup> The Greek word admits either rendering, and is rendered "And" by the Revisers in the previous verse.



**xvi. 9, 10]** We have the marginal note "*Basket* in ver. 9 and 10 represents different Greek words." Yes; and in the separate accounts of the two miracles in question the Greek words are likewise different. In the miracle of the 5,000 the baskets were *kophinoi*, small hand-baskets; in the miracle of the 4,000 they were *spyrides*, in one of which Paul was let down from the wall of Damascus. It is particularly important that this should be brought out, because otherwise the miracle of the 4,000 seems, from the smaller number of persons fed, the greater supply of food, and the fewer baskets, in every respect smaller than the miracle of the 5,000.

It would have been quite possible to express the distinction either by "hand-baskets" and "baskets," or by "baskets" and "hampers."

**xvi. 17. Simon Bar-Jonah]** Here the very serious blunder has been committed of adding an *h* to "Jona," and so identifying it with the name of the prophet Jonah. The two are quite distinct. "Jonah," the prophet's name, means "dove"; "Jona," the name of Simon's father, is a contraction of "Jochanan" "John," and means "God is gracious." Simon is actually called "son of John" in John i. 42, xxi. 15, 16, 17, and we know that he was likewise so called in the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews. Thus the Septuagint, or Jewish translation of the Old Testament into Greek, calls Jochanan, the son of Kareah, "Jona" in 2 Kings xxv. 23, whom elsewhere it calls "Joanan."

I can only suppose that the Revisers were misled by the fact that "Jona" in this passage is written with an

accent which implies that it means Jonah, and not John. But, as accents were not (at least ordinarily) used in manuscripts when this Gospel was written, and are not even found in our own oldest manuscripts of the New Testament, but have merely been added by later copyists, this is a point of not the slightest value.

One of the most distinguished of the Revisers, Bishop Lightfoot, has (on p. 159 of his book *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*) so clearly shown that "Jona" here does not represent "Jonah" that the alteration of the Revisers is most surprising.

The same error is found in the marginal note (*Gr. Joanes*: called in Matt. xvi. 17, *Jonah*) to the name "John" in John i. 42 ("Simon the son of John").

**xvi. 22. Be it far from thee, Lord]** A minority of the Revisers would have rendered "*God* have mercy on thee, Lord." The literal Greek is "[*God be*] gracious unto thee, Lord," and "Mercy on thee, Lord," would have been at once closer and more English than the old rendering.

**xvi. 23. Get thee behind me, Satan]** Of these words addressed to Peter the translation should have been "Get thee behind me, adversary," with a marginal note "*Gr. satan.*"

The Hebrew word *shatan*, "adversary," Greek *satanas*, our "Satan," occurs fourteen times in the Old Testament. In only five of these cases is it used as a proper name or title; in the other nine it has no reference to Satan at all. Thus in Num. xxii. 22 the Hebrew is "the angel of the LORD stood in the way for a *shatan*

against him." And it is to my mind quite plain that it is simply in this sense that Jesus applies it to Simon.

The word *diabolos*, commonly applied to the "Devil," is also thrice used in the New Testament in its original wider sense; *i.e.* in John vi. 70, 1 Tim. iii. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 3. In the last two cases the Revisers render it "slanderer"; but in John vi. 70, where it ought to have been rendered "an adversary," they have rendered it "a devil," in spite of the fact that the New Testament (see p. 36) knows only one devil—"the Devil."

**xvii. 4. three tabernacles]** A minority of the Revisers wished to substitute for "tabernacles" the word "booths," and either that, or "tents," or "shelters," should have been substituted.

The word "tabernacle" itself means no more than this originally, but it has so completely acquired a secondary meaning in connexion with the sacred tent or tabernacle erected by Moses that its use in a passage like this, or Luke xvi. 9 (where the Revisers have introduced it), is most incongruous.

From Luke ix. 32, 37, the time of the narrative must be put at *night*, and in Luke ix. 33, we are told that Moses and Elijah were departing. According to Luke, then, Peter wished to detain them, and, forgetting that heavenly visitants would not need warmth and shelter, proposed to set up three booths wherein Jesus and they might pass the night. These booths would doubtless have been made with branches of trees, like the booths in which the people lived every year during the Feast of Ingathering, thence called the Feast of Booths, or by us the Feast of Tabernacles.

**xviii. 17. tell it unto the church]** A minority of the Revisers rightly wished to render not "church," but "congregation," and not to put upon the word the distinctively Christian application which was afterwards given to it.

There can be little doubt that the synagogue-congregation is meant. Obstinate offenders were denounced in the synagogues. The great mediaeval Jewish commentator Maimonides says "If any refuse to feed his children, they reprove him, they shame him, they urge him ; if he still refuse, they make proclamation against him in the synagogue, saying ' N. is a cruel man, and will not nourish his children ; more cruel than the unclean birds themselves, for they feed their young ones.'"

**xix. 1. and came into the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan]** This is extremely ambiguous ; it might be taken to mean "the borders of Judæa-beyond-Jordan," which would be quite wrong. The rendering should have been, literally, "and came into the borders of Judæa, across the Jordan."

**xix. 5. and said, For this cause]** According to this rendering the words in question are put in the mouth of God. According to Gen. ii. 24, whence they are quoted, they are either spoken by Adam, or, as seems much more likely, are a remark of the narrator. Now, of course, it may be said that Jesus attributes them to God because he inspired the narrator ; but I wish to point out that in Mark x. 7 Jesus does not attribute them to God, but utters them, it would seem, quite independently. I think then that we should render,

*just as literally*, "And he said," i.e. "And Jesus said."

**xix. 14. Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me]** The punctuation is wrong; there should be no comma after "not." If it had been meant that "to come unto me" should go with "suffer" as well as with "forbid not," the Greek would unquestionably have run "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." Those who cannot read the original may think "Suffer" uncouth without a following verb. The Greek verb, however, is *incessantly* so used in the New Testament, although this is to a great extent invisible to the English reader (but not in iv. 15) because it has been rendered by different English words; indeed, in not one of the first thirteen instances in the New Testament is it followed by a verb. Had the present passage been in a pagan writer, any one translating it into modern English would say "Let the little children alone, and do not forbid them to come to me."

**xx. 13. Friend, I do thee no wrong]** The word rendered "Friend" is literally "Fellow," and should have been so rendered here and in xxii. 12, xxvi. 50. Except in those two cases (where it is addressed to the man who came in to the wedding-feast without a wedding-garment, and to Judas at the very moment of the betrayal) it is not used anywhere else in the New Testament.

**xxi. 4. Now this is come to pass]** The rendering should be "And this is come to pass," to make it clear that this is part of the speech of Jesus, as it certainly is—see previous note on i. 22.

**xxi. 41. He will miserably destroy those miserable men]** The rendering should have been, quite literally, "Evil men in evil sort will he destroy them."

**xxii. 23. came to him Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection]** Against "which say" we have the marginal note "Gr. *saying*." Now, if the Greek be "*saying*", it certainly does not mean "which say," but that the Sadducees *in question* came to Jesus "and said."

Clearly there is an accidental confusion here. There are two Greek readings of the passage; one is "those saying" (which should be rendered in English "they which say") and the other "*saying*" without "those." It is this latter reading which modern editors adopt, and of which the Revisers signified their adoption in the list of their readings given to the Cambridge University Press; but their text clearly represents the other reading which they rejected.

The American Committee saw there was something wrong, and, evidently supposing that the Revisers had adopted the reading "those saying," they proposed that the marginal note should be not "Gr. *saying*," but "Many ancient authorities read *saying*." The Revisers, had they on receiving this suggestion compared their text with the original as well as comparing their margin with it, would have detected the error.

**xxii. 42. whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David]** It is admitted by every one that our New Testament ought to contain as few italicized insertions as possible; why not for "*The son of David*" have rendered, literally, "David's"?

**xxiii. 2. The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat]** Here the past tense (which I should often render "have sat," but which the Revisers would render "sat" wherever possible) is in any case wrongly translated as a present. Whether it here means "sat," *i.e.* they took Moses' seat, or "have sat," *i.e.* they have taken Moses' seat, I do not know; but "sit" at least is wrong in New Testament Greek.

**xxiii. 37. even as a hen gathereth her chickens]** The Greek is "even as a bird gathereth her young ones." It is true that the Greek word for "bird" is used also (as the English word "fowl" has come to be almost exclusively used) for the most domestic of birds, but that does not justify a forced restriction of it where the meaning may be more general. The Revisers have changed all the "fowls" of the Authorized Version to "birds," else I should suggest "fowl" and "young ones"; as it is, "bird" and "young ones" should be rendered.

**xxiv. 43. if the master of the house had known in what watch the thief was coming, he would have watched]** Here some connexion between "watch" and "watched" is accidentally suggested to the English reader, whereas the two Greek words are quite unconnected. For "watched" render literally "kept awake" or "been waking."

"Watch" is really only a South-country form of "wake" (as "be-seech" of "seek," "ditch" of "dyke"), and meant "keep awake" when the Authorized Version was made: compare Shakspeare's 61st Sonnet, "For thee watch I whilst thou dost wake elsewhere." But its retention in that strict meaning deprives of their full force several passages towards the end of this Gospel.

**xxv. 1, 3. took their lamps]** A minority of the Revisers rightly wished to render not "lamps" but "torches." The Greek word *lampas* does not mean "lamp," it does mean "torch."

The Hebraist Lightfoot quotes from the Talmud "It is the fashion in the country of the Ismaelites to carry the bride from the house of her father to the house of the bridegroom . . . and to carry before her about ten wooden staves, having each of them on the top a vessel like a dish, in which there is a piece of cloth with oil and pitch: these, being lighted, they carry before her for torches."

The Greeks also used nuptial torches.

**xxv. 13. Watch therefore]** For "Watch" we should have "Be waking" or "Be wakeful"—see above on xxiv. 43.

**xxv. 14, 15. going into another country . . . went on his journey]** Here the first four words express one Greek word (*apodēmōn*), the present participle of a verb, and the last four words express also one Greek word (*apedēmēsen*), being a past tense of the same verb. The verb in question means "to leave one's township." We should have some such rendering as "going from home . . . went from home."

**xxv. 35, 36]** These verses consist of three clauses, each containing two sections parallel to each other in the spirit of Hebrew poetry: but the punctuation does not show this. The verses should have been punctuated thus:—

"For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink. I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me. I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me



And similarly in verses 42, 43.

**xxvi. 22. Is it I, Lord ?**    The same disregard of  
**xxvi. 25. Is it I, Rabbi ?** ] the force of the Greek  
 interrogative *mēti* which I have called attention to on  
 xii. 23 is again shown.

The proper renderings would be "It is not I, Lord ?  
 . . . It is not I, Rabbi ?" or "It is not I, Lord, is it ?  
 . . . It is not I, Rabbi, is it ?" or "Surely it is not I,  
 Lord ? . . . Surely it is not I, Rabbi ?"

**xxvi. 34. before the cock crow**] This rendering  
 furnishes a very curious instance of the importance of  
 translating literally where possible. In the recently  
 published book *Rabbi Jeshua* we are told that it was  
 no cock at all that crew, but the Temple-crier—who  
 was called "the cock." Describing the events of the  
 night before the Crucifixion, the writer says "the  
 faithful Simeon . . . sat among the menials of the  
 great house, and heard the voice of the Temple crier  
 ("the cock," as he was called) proclaim the dawn,  
 sadly recalling the sad presage of his master that before  
 that dawn broke he would be forsaken and betrayed."

I will not here again, as I have done in another  
 work, examine and refute the grounds (derived from  
 certain misunderstood passages in the Talmud) on  
 which that statement is made. It is sufficient to say  
 that it is erroneous, and that in all the Gospel-  
 accounts "the cock" is never once spoken of in the  
 Greek—it is always "a cock." Were this apparent in  
 our version, the reader of *Rabbi Jeshua* would re-  
 member it as an evidence against the interpretation  
 there given : as it is, if he cannot refer to the original,  
 he perhaps thinks to himself "It certainly is in favour

of this interpretation that the Gospels always speak of *the* cock."

**xxvi. 41. Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation]** A minority of the Revisers rightly demurred to this punctuation, and desired "Watch ye, and pray that," &c. In the first place this gives, to my mind at least, better sense: in the second it is confirmed by Luke's account of the previous words (xxii. 40), "Pray that ye enter not into temptation"—where the English is indeed ambiguous but the Greek is perfectly definite, and means, not "Pray, in order that," but "Pray God to grant that."

**xxvii. 15. at the feast]** A minority of the Revisers wished to substitute "at a feast." The Greek is "at feast," which may mean "at every feast [of the Passover]," or "at every one of the [three great] feasts"; or we may understand the indefinite article, and render "at a feast," i.e. at some one of the three great feasts—but this is less probable, because we should have expected the Greek to be more explicit, and also because we may be morally sure that if Pilate released a prisoner at only one of the feasts it would always be at Passover. It is improbable that "at feast" means "during the feast"; for then we should have expected the Greek to be "in the feast" as it is in xxvi. 5. "At feast" should have been left, or for the sake of English idiom "at feast-time" substituted—preserving the ambiguity of the Greek. It cannot be right to limit in a translation the meanings which the original may bear.

**xxvii. 18. that for envy they had delivered him up]** The Greek word rendered "envy" also means "malice," which seems more suitable.

**xxvii. 24. when Pilate saw that he prevailed nothing]** "Prevailed" should have been "availeth": the original means "that he benefiteth nothing," "that he is doing no good."

**xxvii. 28. put on him a scarlet robe]** "Robe" conveys the idea of a flowing garment, whereas the Greek word means "cloak," "mantle." It is the term applied to the scarlet cloak which Roman officers wore clasped round the throat and thrown back over the shoulders, and doubtless it was one of their own centurions' cloaks which the soldiers put on Jesus.

**xxvii. 34. mingled with gall]** The Greek word, though "gall" is its primary meaning, is used in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament to translate the Hebrew *rôsh*, which was certainly not gall; and in the present case the actual ingredient was the bitter drug myrrh (Mark xv. 23). If "bitters" be too unscriptural, "bitterness" would be preferable to "gall."

**xxvii. 56. Mary Magdalene]** In the Greek she is always called "Mary the Magdalene," i.e. the woman of Magdala, except in Luke xxiv. 10, where she is called "the Magdalene Mary," but where the Revisers still have "Mary Magdalene." The article should have been kept, the more especially as it would imply that she took her name from some place (Magdala it was)—which the ordinary English reader cannot otherwise be expected to know.

**xxvii. 66. the guard being with them]** In altering the old rendering the Revisers should have rendered, literally, "in company with the guard."

**xxviii. 14. we will persuade him, and rid you of care]** "Rid you of care" sounds very stiff. The

Greek is "make you unanxious." Why not "set you at ease"?

**xxviii. 16. into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them]** Considering that "the mountain" is ordinarily used in the Gospels to denote the highlands generally which lay round the Sea of Galilee, and not a particular mountain (see pp. 16, 17)—considering also that the Greek does not say "the mountain which"—I submit that the preposition *eis* should be rendered, literally, "into" before "mountain" as well as before "Galilee," and the comma removed so as to follow "mountain"—"into Galilee into the mountain, where Jesus had appointed them."

I have now commented on<sup>1</sup> one single book out of the Revised New Testament, and I ask, if these criticisms are just, if only one quarter of them were just, ought we, after waiting 270 years for an improved version, to be content to accept this one without further revision? It may be said, "We cannot begin revising again just now—let us wait a generation or two." My answer is, that in that case we may have to wait another 270 years, and that under any circumstances our version ought to be made now as good as it can be made: this generation has the same need for the best possible version as any future generation can have.

I do not indeed suppose that all books of the New Testament would afford so many points for criticism as this on which I have been commenting. Probably not nearly so many in proportion would be found in the

<sup>1</sup> It must be remembered that many of the foregoing comments refer to a number of passages, and that many of them are applicable to other Gospels.

Pauline Epistles, the Revision Company being singularly strong in men who have done most valuable work on them. But, if only one book be so defective, that book ought to be further revised. And there can be no doubt that in the next year or two so large an amount of detailed criticism will be bestowed on the new version as to give the Revisers ample opportunity of detecting and remedying its insufficiencies.

Lastly, let me beg that no one will consider, however strongly my opinion on particular points may have been stated, that I for one moment disparage the ability of the Revision Company. Had I been the Convocation of Canterbury I should have been content to trust the revision to one-third of the Revisers. Indeed the fact that in so large a company there must have been some below the level of others in scholarship, critical faculty, and courage (though who such were I at least have no means even of guessing), together with the rule necessitating a two-thirds majority for changes in the text, have probably made the version less perfect than if it had been executed by eight selected members, of whom five should have been a sufficient majority. But of the great amount of ability that is apparent in the Revised Version there can be no question, and anyone at least who has made a special study of the narrative part of the New Testament in the original text should, in his own hopelessness of exhausting its meaning, and of expressing that meaning at once with perfect faithfulness and in perfect compliance with the demands of popular translation, feel gentleness towards the new version in its weakness as well as admiration for it in its strength.

## APPENDICES.

### 1. GREEK OF WORDS REFERRED TO IN CHAPTER IV.

- i. 1. Βίβλος γενέσεως.  
20. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος.  
22. Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν.
- ii. 1. Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος.  
„ μάγοι.  
2. προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.  
5. διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.  
6. ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν κ.τ.λ.  
12. χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ.
- iv. 1. πειρασθῆναι.  
2. ἐπείνασε.  
3. Εἰ υἱὸς εἰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.  
18. βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον.  
24. δαιμονιζομένους.  
25. ὄχλοι πολλοὶ.
- v. 18. ἰῶτα ἐν ᾗ μία κεραία.  
40. χιτῶνα . . . ἱμάτιον.  
47. τελῶναι.
- vi. 11. Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον.  
13. ἀλλὰ ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

Paul's words in 2 Tim. iv. 18 are Ὑψεται  
με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, καὶ σώσει  
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον· ᾧ ἡ δόξα  
εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

- viii. 19. Διδάσκαλε.  
 20. κατασκηνωσεις.
- ix. 16. τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ.  
 24, 25. τὸ κοράσιον.  
 30. ἐνεβριμήσατο αὐτοῖς.
- x. 3. (1) Θαδδαῖος. (2) Λεββαῖος. (3) Λεββαῖος  
 ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος.  
 8. δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε.
- xi. 6. ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί.  
 17. ἐκόψασθε.  
 19. Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν { ἔργων } αὐτῆς.  
 { τέκνων }
- xii. 23. Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβὶδ;  
 32. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι.  
 40. κήτους.
- xiii. 24. Ὡμοιώθη.  
 xv. 27. καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει.
- xvi. 17. Βὰρ Ἰωνᾶ—which should be accented Βὰρ  
 Ἰωνά.  
 22. Ἰλεὺς σοι.  
 23. σατανᾶ.
- xvii. 4. σκηνάς.
- xviii. 17. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.
- xix. 1. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ  
 Ἰορδάνου.  
 5. καὶ εἶπεν.  
 14. Ἀφετε τὰ παιδιά, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν  
 πρὸς με.
- xx. 13. Ἐταῖρε.
- xxi. 4. Τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν.  
 41. Κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς.

- xxii. 23. προσήλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι, λέγοντες, is the reading which the Revisers state themselves to have adopted, and with which their margin corresponds.

The other reading, which they state themselves to have rejected, but with which their text corresponds, is π.α.Σ. οἱ λέγοντες.

42. Τοῦ Δαβίδ.  
 xxiii. 2. ἐκάθισαν.  
 37. ὄρνις . . . νοσσία.  
 xxiv. 43. φυλακῇ . . . ἐγρηγόρησεν.  
 xxv. 13. Γρηγορεῖτε.  
 xxvi. 22, 25. Μῆτι ἐγὼ εἰμι;  
 34. πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι.  
 41. Γρηγορεῖτε, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν.

In Luke xxii. 40, Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν.

- xxvii. 15. Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν.  
 xxvi. 5 has ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ.  
 18. φθόνον.  
 24. ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ.  
 28. χλαμύδα.  
 34. χολῆς.  
 56. Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή.

In Luke xxiv. 10, ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία.

66. μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας.  
 xxviii. 14. καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους ποιήσομεν.  
 16. εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος, οὗ ἐτάξατο αἰτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς.



## 2. RENDERING OF THE AORIST.

IN the Authorized Version the Greek aorist is very often rendered as a perfect—"I have done," "I am come"; not "I did," "I came." To do this is generally looked on as bad scholarship, and the Revisers have accordingly "often ventured to represent the Greek aorist by the English preterite, even where the reader may find some passing difficulty in such a rendering, because we have felt convinced that the true meaning of the original was obscured by the presence of the familiar auxiliary." I hold, nevertheless, that, unless unsuited to the context, the rendering with the auxiliary is always allowable, and that it is sometimes imperative.

Winer (Moulton's ed., 1877, p. 344) says "There is no passage in which it can certainly be proved that the aorist stands for the perfect. . . . More specious examples of this interchange would perhaps be L. xiv. 18, ἀγρὸν ἡγόρασα; xiv. 19, ζεύγη βοῶν ἡγόρασα κ.τ.λ. . . . But in all these instances the action is merely represented as having occurred, as filling a point of past time, as simply and absolutely past (in L. xiv. in antithesis to a present act)—I *bought* a field, a yoke of oxen, etc."

Let us turn to the verses referred to—Luke xiv. 18-20: "The first said unto him, I have bought [*Gk. aorist*] a field, and I must needs go out and see it: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have bought [*Gk. aorist*] five yoke of oxen, and

I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have married [*Gk. aorist*] a wife, and therefore I cannot come."

It is allowed by every one that the idea which lies in the perfect "I have done," "I am come," and does not lie in the aorist "I did," "I came," is present permanence of the result of past action. Now in the above passage of Luke is not this surely the very essence of the past tense? Did one man want to be excused because he once bought a field, another because he once bought five yoke of oxen, a third because he once married a wife? No; but because the result of their doing these things in the past was continuous up to the present, and stopped them from going to the wedding; they *had* done this and that. The Authorized Version is quite right in its rendering, and Winer quite wrong.

Again, what are we to say to the following? John iii. 32, "What he hath seen [*Gk. perfect*] and heard [*Gk. aorist*], of that he beareth witness"; Acts xxii. 15, "For thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen [*Gk. perfect*] and heard [*Gk. aorist*]." Will anyone hold that there is meant to be the slightest difference between the aorist and the perfect in these passages?

Farrar says (*Gk. Syntax*, pp. 126-7) "*Very rarely indeed we are compelled by the English idiom to introduce the present perfect (or perfect with "have") in rendering the aorist. . . . All such cases prove, not any identity of meaning between the tenses, but a different intellectual standpoint; the aorists here (as in*

modern Greek) express merely a finished past action, with no reference to the *time* of completion."

Now, as it is very seldom indeed that we are tempted in classical Greek to render an aorist as a perfect, while we are so tempted very often indeed in the Greek of the N.T., it follows that if Farrar be right we get a delicate psychological difference between the N.T. writers and the classical Greek writers. And it seems to me far more likely to allow that one of those accommodations had taken place which are so common in the history of speech, and of which the N.T. gives us at least one unquestioned example in the frequent substitution of the subjunctive for the optative mood.

We know indeed that modern Greek has gone very much farther. It has altogether thrown over the classical perfect except in the passive participle, and uses instead sometimes the verb "have" or "am" with that participle, and sometimes the aorist, as in ἀκόμη δὲν ἦλθε, "he is not yet come."

The reasons of the change were doubtless that dislike to reduplication which in modern Greek has shorn it away from the last relic of the perfect, its passive participle, leaving not γεγραμμένος, but γραμμένος; and maybe also a liking for the soft ending -σα of the aorist rather than the guttural -κα of the perfect.

I hold, then, that, like the Latin perfect and the modern Greek aorist, the aorist of the N.T. had the twofold power of aorist and perfect, and that in rendering it we should be guided by the context. To deny this in face of the immense number of apparent examples of the second power which the N.T. yields,

and to set up instead "a different intellectual standpoint" (of which we have no other evidence) for the N.T. writers, is, in my judgement, to sink from grammatical reverence to grammatical superstition.

The Revisers indeed say "A remarkable illustration may be found in the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, where the combination of the aorist and the perfect shows, beyond all reasonable doubt, that different relations of time were intended to be expressed." I answer as follows: (1) The two forms may be there used indifferently (as they came into the mind) as being indifferent. (2) Why have the Revisers left unchanged the two passages quoted above, John iii. 32, and Acts xxii. 15, unless they felt that there, at least, different relations of time were *not* intended to be expressed? (3) In John xvii. every single aorist<sup>1</sup> after "spake" in verse 1 may be rendered as a perfect, and will give just as good sense. (4) The perfects in that chapter may be used not because the aorist *had not* a perfect sense, but because it *had* an aorist sense; *i.e.* because it was ambiguous *per se* and there would be nothing to show that it was meant to have a perfect sense in these cases.

<sup>1</sup> The English reader may turn every "gavest," &c., in the chapter into "hast given," &c., except "had" in verse 5, "were" in verse 6, "was" and "kept" in verse 12, which four are not rendered from Greek aorists, but from Greek imperfects.

## 3. PUNCTUATION OF THE REVISED VERSION.

THE Revisers say "Great care has been bestowed on the punctuation. Our practice has been to maintain . . . that system which, especially for convenience in reading aloud, suggests such pauses as will best ensure a clear and intelligent setting forth of the true meaning of the words." Nevertheless one of the most elementary principles of that system is broken on every page.

If a good punctuator writes, *but his enemy came*, he of course puts no stops between any of the words. But, if between *but* and *his* he interpolates the subsidiary clause *while men slept*, he marks off the beginning and end of that clause by commas, writing *but, while men slept, his enemy came*. Not so the punctuators of the Revised Version, who write *but while men slept, his enemy came* (Matt. xiii. 25), marking off the end of the interpolation but not the beginning, and making it appear as if *but* belonged to *while men slept* instead of to *his enemy came*.

This fault seems to be repeated wherever a conjunction is followed by an adverbial clause ; there are three other instances on the same page—in verses 21, 26, 29.

BY THE SAME WRITER.

(Published by C. KEGAN PAUL & Co., 1, Paternoster Square.)

*Just Published, 8vo, cloth, 12s.*

A NEW COMMENTARY

ON

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

Being also Vol. I. of a New Commentary on the Historical Books of the New Testament. Among its special features are an abundance of illustration from the Talmud and other Jewish sources, and the entire absence of all expression or implication of particular theological opinions.

*8vo, cloth, 9s. 6d.*

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS:

ITS FRAGMENTS TRANSLATED AND ANNOTATED, WITH A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE RELATING TO IT.

"Considering the esteem in which it was held by antiquity, the Gospel according to the Hebrews has hardly received from English scholars the attention it deserves, and Mr. Nicholson has rendered an important service. . . . His treatment of the subject, it must be said, is much fuller and more complete than that of Hilgenfeld."—*Academy*.

"The plan is comprehensive, embracing all that is necessary to a full view of the subject. . . . The work bears evidence of careful research. Labour and time have been freely spent upon it, with an earnest desire to obtain satisfactory results."—*Athenæum*.

"The result of some highly creditable and patient work. . . . The list of fragments and of references has never been so completely made . . . very valuable annotations."—*British Quarterly*.

"His industrious investigation . . . the facts are carefully and laboriously set out."—*Church Quarterly*.

"Has conferred a benefit on English readers . . . his honesty and diligence."—*Church Times*.

"Very valuable addition to English theological literature. All attainable information necessary for forming an opinion on the question seems to be put together. . . . Mr. Nicholson writes from a neutral stand-point, assuming neither orthodox nor heterodox premises; or, in other words, taking nothing for granted, attaching himself to no party. . . . Written with rare freedom from foregone convictions . . . a work which is likely to be long accepted as the best on its subject."—*Spectator*.

"A vast amount of patient care and laborious research."—*Westminster Review*.

8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

## THE RIGHTS OF AN ANIMAL:

A NEW ESSAY IN ETHICS.

WITH EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN LAWRENCE.

"If he could induce clergymen and other teachers of morality to show ignorant people how needful it is to study the wants of all the living beings they have in their charge, he would have done much for the happiness of the world."—*Academy*.

"Will repay every one to read well. . . . Its arguments are models of accuracy and conciseness of thought and expression, and suggest even more than they dwell on—hence the book is adapted less for cursory perusal than earnest investigation. In fact, it is a book that should be on the shelves of every animal-lover."—*Animal World*.

"Keeps his advocacy of animals' rights well within certain limits of common-sense. . . . The extracts from Lawrence . . . are interesting additions to a quaint and simple essay on this branch of ethics."—*British Quarterly*.

"A weighty little book, to which we desire to draw particular attention. . . . We urge the purchase and perusal of the book on the clergy, that they may work its material into sermons and lectures, and so spread its teaching widely throughout the country."—*Church Times*.

"Both the Essay and the Appendix are such as to claim, as a kind of right, that they should be studied carefully. They together form one of the ablest additions to works on the claims of animals to be kindly treated we have seen since the late Sir Arthur Helps's work."—*Land and Water*.

"Characterized by great thoughtfulness, often by striking originality, and by a thorough independence of mind. . . . The great point in regard to such subjects as the one before us is to get people seriously to think of them. This Mr. Nicholson will do wherever his book may be read. He has, therefore, done a service both to humanity and to the living nature that is not humanity. The extracts in the Appendix are admirable."—*Nonconformist*.

"Much ability and logical force. . . . There is a tone of healthy common-sense and an absence of false sentiment about the essay, which make it a really valuable contribution to the literature of the subject."—*Scotsman*.

"The public is much indebted to Mr. Nicholson for this able and manly essay. He goes back to first principles, treats the whole question with thoroughness and candour, and puts it, we think, on a satisfactory basis."

*Spectator*.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.

## THE CHRIST-CHILD, AND OTHER POEMS.

"No piece which does not possess some grace or tenderness, or touch of fancy or of humour. . . . Proves the presence amongst us of a man of true poetical feeling and culture."—*Academy*.

"Among the writers of verse he would have an unusual prospect of distinction. . . . Whatever style Mr. Nicholson chooses to employ he uses with grace and skill."—*Spectator*.

C. KEGAN PAUL AND CO., PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

